DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 246 SP 034 268

AUTHOR Marshall, Patricia L.
TITLE Toward a Theoretical Framework for the Design of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (72nd, Detroit, MI, November 20, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Development; Educational Research; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; Program Improvement; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

Teacher education has long been criticized for the absence of a theoretical base. From a multicultural perspective, this dilemma has created an untenable situation because it calls into question the effectiveness of the training teachers receive in this area. This paper consists of a three-part discussion and explores possible foundations for a theoretical framework for multicultural education in teacher education programs. The discussion focuses on: (1) the recent history of multicultural teacher education including perspectives of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education commission, and the National Council for the Social Studies; (2) research literature wherein cognitive developmental theory has been used as a framework for teacher education in general and multicultural education in particular; and (3) ways in which teacher concerns might be merged with research in cognitive development to form a theoretical base for multicultural teacher education. The Multicultural Teaching Concerns Survey, an instrument developed to explore types of concerns teachers have about working in pluralistic school settings, is introduced. (Contains 29 selected references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353246

TOWARD A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE DESIGN OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A Paper Presented to the
College and University Faculty Assembly of the
National Council for the Social Studies
at the 72nd Annual Meeting
Detroit, MI
November 20, 1992

Patricia L. Marshall, Ed.D.
North Carolina State University
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
College of Education and Psychology
402 Poe Hall; Box 7801
Raleigh, NC 27695-7801

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP034268

TOWARD A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE DESIGN OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Teacher education has long been criticized for its absent theoretical base. From a multicultural perspective this chronic dilemma has created an untenable situation because it calls into question the effectiveness of the training teachers receive in this area. Using a three-part discussion this paper will explore possible foundations for a theoretical framework for multicultural education in teacher education programs.

The first part of the paper will be a discussion of the longstanding dialogue over the absent theoretical framework for teacher education. The manner in which this situation has reflected upon multicultural education in the field will be addressed. The second part will examine the research literature wherein cognitive developmental theory has been used as a framework for teacher education in general and multicultural education in teacher education in particular. The final part will explore how teacher concerns might be merged with research in cognitive development to form a theoretical base for multicultural education in teacher education. In conjunction with this final part, the Multicultural Teaching Concerns Survey will be introduced. While the introduction of the survey will be limited to a discussion of its initial development phases, it should be noted that the survey is in the process of being refined for future discussion and exploration.

The Absent Framework for Teacher Education: A Recent Historical Overview

Examining the recent history of teacher education reveals that its staunchest critics have been persons outside the field. Among the more piercing denunciations have been those presented in the barrage of commentaries published in the 60s. The 1963 publication of The Education of American Teachers is illustrative. Author James Bryant Conant described what can only be characterized as mass chaos within the teacher education bureaucracy. Probably the most caustic criticisms offered during that era were noted in The Miseducation of American Teachers (1963) wherein James D. Koerner left no aspect of the public education arena unscathed. Examining what he perceived as an elusive purpose for teacher education and the seemingly capricious manner in which issues were addressed within the field, Koerner noted

> [e]ducation continues to want for a viable definition of its own purposes and for a ***theoretical foundation*** [emphasis added] to give form to its multifarious programs and activities. (p. 32)

Though many of the more offending criticisms have been introduced by persons outside the field, scholars within the field have also questioned aspects of teacher education (Brandt and Gunter, 1981; Brodbelt, 1984; Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1983; Haigh and Katterns, 1984; Howsam, 1981; Joyce and Clift, 1984; Keesbury, 1984; Long, 1984). Although teacher educators have subjected their own efforts to critical examination, it seems too

many concerns relative to teacher education portray a cyclical re-emergence of what could be termed ephemeral interests. Marshall (1987) noted that historical obsessions with peripheral catch slogans and ideas of the day, have inadvertently served to divert attention from the more substantive issues facing teacher education. Foremost among these issues is the theoretical base upon which teacher education rests.

A theoretical framework for teacher education is needed to aide in explicating the complex decisions involved in training teachers. Ryan (1979) characterized teacher education content as "rarely if ever derived from theory" (cited in Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall, 1983, p. 75). Similar to critics of the 60s era, Haberman (1983) noted that content and process [in teacher education] are based on political rather than educational decisions. The absence of a consensually accepted theoretical base in teacher education in many respects is perplexing; however when viewed from the perspective of teacher training for multicultural education, the oversight seems especially problematic. In this regard, a non-theory base for the field attracts unflattering appraisals; however because multicultural training is a fairly recent element in teacher education, the omission of an articulable theoretical base invites its dismantling.

While scholars in teacher education have examined and critiqued the field for its largely atheoretical base, similar explorations have also been made regarding multicultural

education. In an exhaustive review of the literature on multicultural education, Grant and Sleeter (1985) urged scholars to begin exploring the conceptual base for multicultural education in pre-service and in-service teacher training programs. Analyzing over 200 journal articles, they concluded that the field is rife with discussions of rationales and goals for multicultural education. However, there is a paucity of literature regarding the theoretical and empirical foundations upon which teacher training for multicultural education rests.

A recent ERIC search of the literature revealed that still, few scholars have addressed the issue of a theoretical base for teacher training in multicultural education. Meanwhile, questions over the manner in which multicultural education has been conceptualized in teacher education persists. The discussion will turn now to a recent historical perspective on the nature of multicultural education in teacher education.

Multicultural Education in Teacher Education

The NCATE Perspective

In some respects when attempting to define multicultural education in teacher education it seems the task is akin to the tale of the four blind people being asked to describe the elephant. The response one receives will depend on which person is asked, and what part of the phenomenon has been experienced. To identify teacher education competencies for multicultural education is to risk minimizing this most important education concept. Likewise, the enormity of the concept multicultural

education invites one to employ abstract ideas. These points notwithstanding, Bennett offers a multifaceted definition of the term that seems instructive:

> [m]ulticultural education is an approach to teaching and learning that is based upon democratic values and beliefs, and seeks to foster cultural pluralism within culturally diverse societies and an interdependent world..... [its] four distinct but overlapping aspects [include] the movement.....; the curricular orientation.....; the process.....and the commitment (p. 11).

As an organized field of study, prior to 1969, teacher education had not issued a statement on the importance or place of multicultural education in teacher education programs. Teachers for the Real World, the 1969 text published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), emerged as the first major work by a teacher education organization to address the urgency of preparing teachers for work with diverse student populations in a deliberate manner. Marshall (1987) noted the book's major themes reflect

> sensitivity to the various social concerns and issues of the sixties decade with [d]iscussions. . .emphasi[zing]. . . recognition and appreciation for the cultural pluralism [in] the American society (p. 120).

Gollnick (n.d.) notes that after the publication of Teachers for the Real World, the AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education issued its 1972 *No One Model American* statement. Therein multicultural education was defined as

> [e]ducation which values cultural pluralism. . . . [M]ulticultural education affirms that schools should be oriented toward the cultural enrichment of all children and youth through programs rooted to the preservation and extension of cultural alternatives.
> . . . . . .
> [multicultural education] affirms. . . cultural diversity as

> a valuable resource that should be preserved and extended . . . [and] that major education institutions should strive to preserve and enhance cultural pluralism.

The emergence of Teachers for the Real World encouraged the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in 1978, to augment its accreditation standards to include a statement on multicultural education in teacher education programs.[1] Prior to the formal adoption of the NCATE multicultural education standard, Gollnick notes colleges and universities were "required to show evidence" of planning for multicultural education, and by 1981 a full blown multicultural standard had been added. The separate NCATE standard that addressed multicultural education then read

> The institution provides for multicultural education in its teacher education curricula including both the general and professional studies components. (NCATE, 1982, p. 14)

While the standard indicated that all NCATE accredited teacher education programs would have to address multicultural education, the specific manner in which this was to be done was never specified. Eventually, the separate multicultural education standard was omitted as a result of the redesign of the NCATE

---

[1] Just over 50% of teacher education programs in the U.S. are accredited by the NCATE. To be sure, teacher education programs differ. However, it is reasonable to assume that the NCATE orientation to teacher education can be utilized to examine the field as a unified whole. Furthermore, the NCATE is the only agency recognized by both the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education to accredit formal teacher education programs. To the extent that the NCATE orientation to teacher education is representative of the field as a whole, examining the NCATE orientation to multicultural education should prove informative.

standards in the 80s. Presently, NCATE requires that programs address multicultural education as a component of the other standards for accreditation. Gollnick notes

> [The NCATE commitment to multicultural education] suggests that educators should learn to think critically about the inequities that exist in the society. A definite shortcoming of the standards is the lack of clarity about the meaning of multicultural and global perspectives and expected outcomes (p. 23).

Since the inclusion of the separate NCATE standard on multicultural education in 1978 and its subsequent revision, 59 teacher education institutions have been reviewed for accreditation while another 45 have hosted on-site reviews. In an examination of selected institutions, Gollnick found that most institutions integrate multicultural education throughout the teacher education curriculum. This is done in separate multicultural education courses, or components of teaching methods courses. Her analysis of NCATE self report studies revealed the following examples of "supporting statements" indicative of how institutions meet the NCATE multicultural education requirement:

> Beginning teachers will be prepared to honor the dignity and rights of every individual learner in agreement with the values of our democratic and pluralistic society.
>
> Teacher candidates will learn to examine cultural biases, prejudices, and stereotypes arising from cultural differences.
>
> Teacher candidates will interact with and observe students of varying cultural backgrounds. We are committed to the preparation of professionals for service in multicultural communities. We believe it is essential to the professions for which we train and the communities they serve that representatives from diverse cultures be actively recruited so that models of excellence are available to all. (p. 27)

Gollnick concludes by noting that while multicultural education in teacher education is varied, it is clearly inadequate. Hence, it seems appropriate to suggest that to some extent the inadequacies in multicultural education in teacher education can be attributed to the inadequacy of the NCATE statements on multicultural education.

The NCATE standards for accreditation, however, are informed by the Constituent Professional Organization members of the NCATE. This is to say, NCATE as an organizational body is influenced by other organizational bodies. So, it seems reasonable to assume that examining statements on multicultural education of NCATE constituent members can provide insights into why the NCATE statements are the way they are. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) is a member of the NCATE constituent group. Thus, the question is raised, what theoretical framework undergirds the NCSS orientation to multicultural education in teacher education?

The NCSS Perspective

In the September 1992 issue of Social Education, the NCSS Task Force on Ethnic Studies issued the revised edition of its position statement and guidelines for multicultural education. Officially known as the "Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education", the statement is divided into two parts: Part One: A Rationale for Ethnic Pluralism and Multicultural Education, and Part Two: Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education. This same issue of Social Education includes the NCSS Standards for

the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers. Using these two NCSS position statements, I gleaned that similar to NCATE, NCSS has not identified a theoretical base for the design of multicultural experiences in teacher education programs.

The term "multicultural education" is explicitly stated or implied in the Standards for Preparation a total of six times. The specific competencies social studies teachers should develop in arriving at an understanding of "the movement, the curricular orientation, the process, or the commitment" have not been described in these program standards. The Curriculum Guidelines on Multicultural Education do include a discussion over the scope of multicultural education. The writers of the Guidelines note that teacher training for multicultural education should begin at the preservice level and continue into the inservice professional phase. They also discuss the general skills, attitudes, perceptions, and content background about working in contemporary school settings that teachers should acquire. Conspicuously absent however, is a description of the theoretical framework undergirding the type of training teachers should receive within teacher education programs.

The omission of an explicit theoretical framework statement for multicultural education in teacher education by the NCSS inadvertently serves to intensify what Shutes contends is the bane of teacher preparation programs in general. That is, multicultural education [is far too likely to suffer from and be] "guided. . . by folk-wisdom and unevaluated experiences, and [be]

noncumulative in building a growing body of reliable, replaceable information (in Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall, 1983b, p. 75). It appears NCSS does little to alleviate this situation. Furthermore, considering the previous discussion on the general inadequacy of multicultural education in NCATE accredited institutions, it is obvious that multicultural education in teacher education is a hit-or miss affair.

Cognitive Development and Teacher Education

Cognitive development theory appears to have promise as a theoretical base for teacher education programs. Major theorist associated with the developmental paradigm include Piaget (time, space, causality development); Kohlberg (value/moral development); Loevinger (ego/self development); Hunt (conceptual development); and Perry (epistemological/ethical development) (Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall, 1983a, p. 17).

Five major assumptions undergirding all of the domains of cognitive developmental theory have been identified:

1. All humans process experience through cognitive structures called stages -- Piaget's concept of schemata.

2. Such cognitive structures are organized in a hierarchical sequence of stages from the less complex to the more complex.

3. Growth occurs first within a particular stage and then only to the next stage in the sequence. This latter change is a qualitative shift-- a major quantum leap to a significantly more complex system of processing experience.

4. Growth is neither automatic nor unilateral but occurs only with appropriate interaction between the human and the environment.

> 5. Behavior can be determined and predicted by an individual's particular stage of development. Predictions, however, are not exact. (Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall, 1983b, p. 16)

Various studies have explored cognitive development as related to teacher education (Hunt & Joyce, 1967; McKibbin & Joyce, 1981; Walters & Stivers, 1977). Implications for cognitive developmental theory have been explored by scholars examining the design of teacher education programs (Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall 1986, 1983a, 1983b, 1981; Oja and Sprinthall, 1978); mentor teacher training programs (Thies-Sprinthall and Sprinthall, 1987; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986; 1984); and readiness for multicultural education (Bennett, Niggle, and Stage 1989). Among early studies conducted with preservice teachers, Hurt and Sprinthall (1977) and Glassberg and Sprinthall (1980) found that stage change or cognitive growth was induced by deliberate rather than random chance occurrences. Similar results were found with studies involving inservice teachers (Oja and Sprinthall, 1978; Thies-Sprinthall 1984).

Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall (1983a) and Thies-Sprinthall and Sprinthall (1987) found that persons operating at higher cognitive levels function in the helping professions in a more democratic and principled manner. They also found that teachers who function at higher cognitive levels express more mature professional concerns about their teaching. The researchers concluded that teacher education programs should strive to facilitate higher cognitive functioning among preservice and inservice teachers.

Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall offer a promising model for the design of teacher education programs. They outline five basic conditions needed in order to promote cognitive development: 1) role taking experiences that involve teachers in legitimate situations similar to those to be undertaken in actual teaching environments; 2) guided reflection wherein teachers are encouraged to explore pertinent aspects of the growth development experiences; 3) balance between role taking and reflection activities such that the teacher will not be overwhelmed by the new growth experience; 4) support and challenge for teachers as they learn to accommodate new ways of thinking and acting; and 5) continuity which provides sufficient time for experiences to become integral aspects of the teacher's professional mode of operation. (p.27-29).

Thus, an emerging theoretical base grounded in cognitive developmental theory awaits teacher educators' eager exploration. Teaching is a complex human helping role, and it seems apparent that teaching in culturally pluralistic school settings increases the complexity of the task. Whereas numerous studies have explored the potential for cognitive developmental theory in teacher education in general, a search of the literature revealed only one study employing cognitive developmental theory as a framework for multicultural education in teacher education.

Bennett, Niggle and Stage (1989) conducted a study in which they explored cognitive development as a probable theoretical framework for multicultural education in pre-service teacher

education programs. They assessed student readiness for multicultural teacher education by using Perry's (1970) construct of intellectual and ethical developmental stage as a predictor.

The primary focus of this study was to determine whether there is a relationship between cognitive development level and knowledge of multicultural education. Three measures (pre and posttest) were obtained from the subjects for the study. They were: a measurement of knowledge on multicultural education using a true-false test; an estimate of students' feeling of social distance toward different racial and ethnic groups using a modified Social Distance Scale; and a measure of Perry's three levels of cognitive development using The Scale of Intellectual Development.[2]

Their findings indicated that those students having the least dualistic orientations had the strongest multicultural knowledge at both entry and exit from the course. Additionally, lower social distance scores were positively correlated with gains in multicultural knowledge. Another noteworthy finding was that differences in dualism levels on posttest knowledge of multicultural education were not statistically significant.

---

[2] Perry's scale measures three levels of cognitive development, dualism, relativism, and commitment. "At the lowest level of development dualism, the individual views the world in absolute terms. At this level phenomena are viewed as either black or white. The next level is relativism, and the final or highest level of student evolution in thinking is known as commitment. In this final level the individual is ready to use criteria to evaluate issues and to actually take a stand" (Bennett et al., 1989, p. 6).

Bennett et al. indicated that this finding may have suggested that the multicultural education course itself "had a similar impact on the development of multicultural knowledge gains among students at all three levels [of intellectual development]" (p. 18). They noted "unless care is taken to 'match' [students'] levels of cognitive and ethical development" (in the actual teaching of the course), the most dualistic students would experience difficulty absorbing the course content. Furthermore, Bennett et al. conclude

> the challenge for teacher education is to design a course to meet the developmental needs of students along a continuum, . . . realizing that incremental changes in attitudes and behavior may be the best one can expect among the most dualistic students (p. 29).

The researchers employed a model of developmental instruction based on the work of Lee Knefelkamp, and offered a design for a course in multicultural education based on varying instruction in four manners. These include: making the degree of structure in the learning environment fit the need for structure as determined by students' intellectual levels, incorporating diversity of learning tasks to meet intellectual levels; allowing for experiential learning tasks ranging from concrete to vicarious; and personalizing the learning environment.

This lone, albeit significant study broached the most critical aspects of exploring cognitive developmental theory for the design of multicultural education in teacher education. Bennett et al. addressed important issues in this study. Among these were anticipating incremental changes in cognitive

functioning, and matching and mismatching instructional modes to induce cognitive growth. A major oversight of this study however, was that it failed to emphasize the importance of time as a factor in the adopting and maintaining new attitudes and behaviors (i.e. changing cognitive functioning) among individuals. Providing "a course" in multicultural education in teacher education is itself inconsistent with the idea of inducing growth along not only Perry's intellectual dimensions, but any dimensions of cognitive development. Furthermore, although Bennett, et al. examined social distance (interracial contact) and student resistance to multicultural education (as a function of cognitive functioning), they did not explore the students' professional teaching concerns. Students' professional concerns about working in pluralistic school settings could be a factor in their attitudes (i.e. resistance or receptivity) toward multicultural education in teacher education programs.

Teaching Concerns and Cognitive Developmental Theory: A Direction for Multicultural Education in Teacher Education?

The potential for cognitive developmental theory in teacher education has been demonstrated in numerous studies. Some of these studies have demonstrated a relationship between cognitive functioning levels and teachers' professional concerns about their work It seems reasonable to suggest that teachers may have different concerns about working with diverse populations. Further, teachers' concerns may reveal why they are resistant or

receptive to the content of multicultural education courses.

Research addressing teachers' professional concerns indicates that teachers do not develop specific "energy-directed" interests in the needs of their students (e.g. engaging in tasks to identify students strengths or weaknesses) until the teachers themselves have satisfied their own personal needs of security and comfort in their role as teacher (Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Bown, 1975; Katz, 1972; Gehrke, 1989; Marshall, Fittinghoff, and Cheney, 1990). Prior to the resolution of this professional "role-conflict", although teachers are interacting with students, the extent to which time and energy is directed toward identifying and addressing the specific learning, social, and emotional needs of students is minimal (Katz, 1972; Marshall, et al., 1990).

Heretofore, multicultural education scholars have not explored teachers' professional concerns about working with diverse student populations. It seems reasonable to suggest that teachers' role-conflict dilemma could, to some degree, be exacerbated by the reality of teaching in a culturally diverse setting. Specifically, teachers may have varying, perhaps hierarchial levels of concern they need to resolve before they are effective in pluralistic school settings.

For example, teachers may initially need to resolve their concerns related to their own need to feel that overall, they have "what it takes" to perform the professional teaching role. Secondly, they may need to address concerns about their ability

to meet the specific needs of students in the majority culture. Finally, teachers in contemporary pluralistic school settings may need to acknowledge and address their concerns about meeting needs peculiar to minority culture students. That students' needs differ and to a great extent are related to the cultural differences students bring to schools is apparent. Equally apparent is the fact that in order for teachers to address the needs of culturally diverse students, teachers will have to acquire certain knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are not subsumed under the information generally acquired for teaching majority culture students. Not so obvious however, is that for good or ill, teachers may harbor professional concerns about having to acquire these "additional" professional understandings essential to teaching culturally diverse students. It is this third level of teacher concern that may have a significant bearing on the schooling experiences of students who are not of the majority culture. And it is this third level of concern that may have considerable influence on teachers' openness and receptivity to training for multicultural education as offered in teacher education programs.

Teacher concerns literature has addressed the concerns of teachers at the pre-service, beginning and inservice levels. (Fuller, 1969; Gehrke, 1989; Marshall, Fittinghoff, and Cheney, 1990; Veenman, 1984). This literature has influenced the development and structure of some aspects of teacher education programs. However, it has failed to address the specific (i.e.

different) professional concerns teachers may have about the prospect or reality of teaching in diverse classroom settings. It is this very consideration that led to efforts to develop the Multicultural Teaching Concerns Survey.

The *Multicultural Teaching Concerns Survey* (MTCS) was developed as an exploration into the types of concerns teachers have about working in pluralistic school settings. Currently, the MTCS is a 64-item instrument designed to assess the intensity of professional concerns teachers (preservice, beginning, and inservice) hold about working with diverse student populations across four categories. These categories are presented in Table 1.

The instrument was developed in two phases. In Phase One participants were asked to respond to an open-ended survey consisting of four questions. They were instructed to identify questions or concerns they (or others that they know) have about working (or the prospect of working) with diverse student populations. The four broad-based, open-ended questions were based on a synthesis of Fuller's (1969) teacher concerns; Katz' (1973) teacher developmental stages; Marshall, Fittinghoff, and Cheney's (1990) beginning teacher micro-phase concerns; and Locke's (1986, 1988) cross-cultural awareness continuum. In Phase Two data were collected using the 64-item instrument.

Scoring. Items for each of the four concern categories in the MTCS are rated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from ***an extremely important question for me at this time*** (5 points) to

an extremely unimportant question for me at this time (1 point). The ratings given each item are summed yielding four sub-scores (i.e. one for each multicultural teaching concern category). Maximum scores for the different categories are: Category I, 85 points; Category II, 100 points; Category III, 105 points; and Category IV, 30 points. A higher sub-score represents more intense concern for the particular category.

Participants. The participants for Phase One of the study were 103 pre-service education majors at North Carolina State University, and 103 elementary, middle, and senior high school classroom teachers in the Wake County School District. The pre-service education majors were undergraduate students enrolled in four different sections of the course "Introduction to Teaching in the Humanities and Social Sciences" (ECI 205). The classroom teachers were cooperating teachers participating in the 8-week school site practicum experience for students enrolled in the ECI 205 course.

The pre-service students were assigned to complete the survey anonymously, and return it to the researcher's office mailbox or to the instructor for their section of ECI 205. Surveys were mailed to classroom teachers with instructions to return the completed anonymous questionnaire in the stamped self-addressed envelope via U.S. mail. Although demographic data were not taken from participants during Phase One of the study, informal estimates were that participants were primarily white-American, predominantly female, teaching (or training to be

teachers) in middle school and high school English and Social Studies.

Phase Two of the survey (which occurred some 10 months later) involved mailing surveys to students who had been enrolled in the ECI 205 course the previous semester, classroom teachers who had participated in Phase One, and two "new groups of ECI 205 students" who were enrolled in the course the following spring semester after the Phase One data had been collected.

Content. The contents of the MTCS was developed in two phases. Phase one, described earlier, involved the generation of the items based on subjects' responses to the four broad-based open-ended questions. This first phase resulted in the formation of 243 items. Phase Two involved organizing the items into the four major multicultural teaching concern categories. While most of the items matched one of the four categories, some item clusters formed "sub-categories". These sub-category items were eventually re-worded so that they could match one of the four major multicultural teaching concern categories.

Two professors specializing in multicultural education in teacher education and one dissertation stage doctoral student who had studied varying aspects of multicultural education as related to teacher and counselor education were used to classify the items into the four multicultural teaching concern categories. Each reviewed descriptions of the categories, discussed his/her interpretation of the categories with the researcher, and then independently matched each item with an appropriate category.

Using a Delphi technique, the item count was reduced from 243 to 159, by eliminating those items that were rated differently by all three experts, and retaining those items that were rated similarly by at least two of the experts. The second rating occurred approximately one month after the first rating, and the item total was reduced from 159 to 103. The third and final rating occurred approximately six weeks after the second rating reducing the items from 103 to the current 64 items. Only items that received 100% agreement by all three experts were retained after the final round. The 64 items were randomly organized to avoid response set.

Procedure. The 64-item survey was sent to 270 participants. Fifty-seven percent or 154 surveys were returned, of those returned 146 were usable. Demographic data were collected from participants for the second phase of the study. This revealed 81% of the respondents were female, 18.5% male; 86.9% Euro-American, 9% African American, 2.8% Hispanic; less than one percent were from other ethnic/racial backgrounds. Preservice education majors comprised 61.6% of the respondents while the other 38.3% were inservice classroom teachers. Several statistical procedures were used to refine the instrument including: the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to estimate the relationship between each concern item previously classified within one of the multicultural teaching concern categories; factor analyses; correlation coefficients for reliability measures, and estimates of construct validity.

Conclusion

The current 64-item MTCS continues to be refined in preparation for studies with larger more heterogeneous populations. However, preliminary analysis of its results suggest that the construct "multicultural teaching concerns" holds promise for providing insights and informing practice in teacher education. The need for further study in this previously unexplored area is obvious. Two areas for research in this area are immediately apparent: 1) exploring whether multicultural teaching concerns are developmental (i.e. increase or decrease in intensity as teachers gain professional experience); and 2) cross-validation of the multicultural teaching concern categories with cognitive measures closely aligned with the overall goals of multicultural education. Locke (1988) proposed that teachers must be aware of their own culture, the culture of others, and the existence of racism, sexism, and classism in the society at large, before they can become effective practitioners in pluralistic classroom settings. Hence, those areas of cognitive development that seem most related to development along Locke's cross-cultural awareness continuum include: ego development, conceptual functioning, and intellectual functioning.

As educators explore cognitive development more seriously as a theoretical base for teacher education, it is clear that they will have to give serious thought to the promises research in this area may hold for informing the practice of multicultural education in teacher education programs. Also, since some studies

have suggested that teachers' professional concerns about their work may be related to their cognitive development, it seems obvious that these two constructs should be explored concurrently as a theoretical base for multicultural education in teacher education is identified. Whether the literature and research on cognitive development and teacher concerns will serve as *the* theoretical base for multicultural education is actually a secondary concern for teacher educators. The primary issue is what theoretical base will inform our practice? Until some semblance of closure is reached on this question, the future success of multicultural education in teacher education will reflect the questionable past.

Table 1

MULTICULTURAL TEACHING CONCERNS SURVEY

Category I *"Familial/Group Knowledge"* Concerns about the completeness of teachers' knowledge about diverse students' familial/group culture and background.	Category II *"Strategies & Techniques"* Concerns about utilizing "proper techniques" and including the most appropriate "diverse" content in curriculum.
Category III *"Interpersonal Competence"* Concerns about the impact of personal attitudes, actions, and/or beliefs on interactions with diverse student populations.	Category IV *"School Bureaucracy"* Concerns about whether the structure of schools (e.g. grouping patterns) and the actions of other school personnel impacts efforts to implement multicultural education in schools.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Bennett, C.I. (1990). Comprehensive Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, C., Niggle, T. and Stage, F. (1989). Preservice Multicultural Teacher Education: Predictors of Student Readiness. ERIC Document Service. ED 308 161.

Brandt, R. and Gunter, A. (1981). Teachers are made, not born. Educational Leadership. November. 149-151.

Brodbelt, S. (1984). Considerations for redesigning teacher education. Clearinghouse. (November). 122-126.

Conant, J.B. (1963). The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Wise, A.E. (1983). Teaching standards or standardized teaching? Educational Leadership. October. 66-69.

Fuller, F.F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: a developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal. 207-226.

Gehrke, N. (1987). On Being a Teacher. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Glassberg, S. and Sprinthall, N. (1980). Student teaching: a developmental approach. Journal of Teacher Education. 31: 31-38.

Gollnick, D.M. (n.d.) Multicultural education: policies and practices in teacher education. Paper developed for The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Grant, C.A. and Sleeter, C.E. (1985). The literature on multicultural education: review and analysis. Educational Review. 37:2. 97-118.

Haberman, M. (1983). Research on preservice laboratory and clinical experiences: implicatons for teacher education. In The Education of Teachers: A Look Ahead. Howey, K. and Gardner, W. (Eds.). New York: Longman. 98-117.

Haigh, N. and Katterns, B. (1984). Teacher effectiveness: problem or goal for education. Journal of Teacher Education. (September-October). 23-27.

Howsam, R.B. (1981). The trouble with teacher preparation. Education Leadership. (November) 144-147.

Hunt, D.E. and Joyce, B. (1967). Teacher trainee personality and initial teaching style. American Educational Research Journal. 4: 253-159.

Hurt, L.B. and Sprinthall, N.A. (1977). Psychological and moral development for teachers. Journal of Moral Education. 6: 112-120.

Joyce, B and Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: essential reform for teacher education. Educational Research. 13:3. 5-17.

Katz, L.G. (1972). Developmental stages of preschool teachers. Elementary School Journal. 50-54.

Keesbury, F.E. (1984). Revisionism and teacher education. The Educational Forum. (Spring) 353-363.

Koerner, J.D. (1963). The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Locke, D.C. (1988). Teaching culturally-different students: growing pine trees of bonsai trees. Contemporary Education. 59:3. 130-133.

_____. (1986). Cross-cultural counseling issues. In Foundations of Mental Health Counseling. Palmo, A.J. and Weikel, W.J. (Eds.). Springfield: Charles C. Thomas. 119-137.

Long, D.H. (1984). Arthur Bestor on education of teachers. The Educational Forum. (Summer). 423-448.

Marshall, P. (1987). Toward a conceptual model for interpreting the value orientations of teacher preparation programs. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 3401-A.

Marshall, P., Fittinghoff, S., and Cheney, C.O. (1990). Beginning teacher developmental stages: implications for creating collaborative internship programs. Teacher Education Quarterly. 25-35.

Oja, S. and Sprinthall, N.A. (1978). Psychological and moral development of teachers. In Sprinthall, N.A. and Moshser, R.L. (Eds.). Value Development as the Aim of Education. Schenectady: NY: Character Research Press. 117-134.

Sprinthall, N.A. and Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1983a). The need for theoretical frameworks in educating teachers: a cognitive-developmental perspective. In The Education of Teachers: A Look Ahead. Howey, K. and Gardner, W. (Eds.). New York: Longman. 74-97.

_____. (1983b). The teacher as an adult learner: a cognitive-developmental view. In Staff Development. 82nd Yearbook National Society for the Study of Education. 13-33.

_____. (1981). Educating for teacher growth: a cognitive developmental perspective. Theory Into Practice. 19:4. 278-286.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. and Sprinthall, N.A. (1987). Experienced teachers: agents for revitalization and renewal as mentors and teacher educators. Journal of Education. 169:1. 65-79.

_____. (1986). Preservice teachers as adult learners: a new framework for teacher education. In M. Haberman and J. Backus (eds.). The Nature and Scope of Research in Teacher Education. N.J.: Ablex Publishers. 15-56.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor training: a working model. Journal of Teacher Education. (November-December). 13-20.

_____. (1984). Promoting the developmental growth of supervising teachers: theory, research programs, and implication. Journal of Teacher Education. 35:3. (May-June) 53-60.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research. 54:2. 143-178.